

Combining Approximation Algorithms for the Prize-Collecting TSP

Michel X. Goemans*

Abstract

We present a 1.91457-approximation algorithm for the prize-collecting travelling salesman problem. This is obtained by combining a randomized variant of a rounding algorithm of Bienstock et al. [2] and a primal-dual algorithm of Goemans and Williamson [5].

1 Introduction

In the prize-collecting travelling salesman problem (PC-TSP), we are given a vertex set V (with $|V| = n$), a metric c on $V \times V$ (i.e. c satisfies (i) $c_{ij} = c_{ji} \geq 0$ for all $i, j \in V$ and (ii) triangle inequality: $c_{ij} + c_{jk} \geq c_{ik}$ for all $i, j, k \in V$), a special vertex $r \in V$ (the depot), penalties $\pi : V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, and the goal is to find a cycle T with $r \in V(T)$ such that

$$c(T) + \pi(V \setminus V(T))$$

is minimized, where $c(T) = \sum_{(i,j) \in T} c_{ij}$, $\pi(S) = \sum_{i \in S} \pi_i$, and $V(T)$ denotes the vertices spanned by T .

The first constant approximation algorithm for PC-TSP was given by Bienstock et al. [2]. It is based on rounding the optimum solution to a natural LP relaxation for the problem, and provides a performance guarantee of 2.5. Goemans and Williamson [5] have designed a primal-dual algorithm based on the same LP relaxation, and this gives a 2-approximation algorithm for the problem. In 1998, Goemans [4] has shown that a simple improvement of the algorithm of Bienstock et al. gives a guarantee of $2.055 \dots = \frac{1}{1-e^{-2/3}}$. Recently, Archer et al. [1] are the first to break the barrier of 2 and provide an improvement of the primal-dual algorithm of Goemans and Williamson; their performance guarantee is 1.990283. In this note, we show that by combining the rounding algorithm of Bienstock et al. and the primal-dual algorithm of Goemans and Williamson, we can obtain a guarantee of $1.91456 \dots = \frac{1}{1-\frac{2}{3}e^{-1/3}}$. The analysis uses the technique in [4] together with an improved analysis of the primal-dual algorithm as observed in [3] and used in Archer et al. [1].

*MIT Department of Mathematics. goemans@math.mit.edu. Supported by NSF contract CCF-0829878 and by ONR grant N00014-05-1-0148.

2 Combining Approximation Algorithms

We start by briefly reviewing the rounding result of Bienstock et al. [2]. Consider a classical LP relaxation of PC-TSP:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \text{Min} \quad \sum_{e \in E} c_e x_e + \sum_v \pi(v)(1 - y_v) \\
 & \text{subject to:} \\
 (LP) \quad & x(\delta(v)) = 2y_v & v \in V \setminus \{r\} \\
 & x(\delta(S)) \geq 2y_v & S \subset V, r \notin S, v \in S \\
 & 0 \leq x_e \leq 1 & e \in E \\
 & 0 \leq y_v \leq 1 & v \in V \\
 & y_r = 1,
 \end{aligned}$$

where E denotes the edge set of the complete graph on E . For conciseness, we use $c(x) + \pi(\mathbf{1} - y)$ to denote the objective function of this LP. Let x^*, y^* be an optimum solution of this LP relaxation, and let $LP = c(x^*) + \pi(\mathbf{1} - y^*)$ denote its value. Bienstock et al. [2] show the following (based on the analysis of Christofides' algorithm due to Wolsey [8] and Shmoys and Williamson [7]).

Proposition 1 (Bienstock et al.). *Let $0 < \gamma \leq 1$ and let $S(\gamma) = \{v : y_v^* \geq \gamma\}$. Let T_γ denote the cycle on $S(\gamma)$ output by Christofides' algorithm when given $S(\gamma)$ as vertex set. Then:*

$$c(T_\gamma) \leq \frac{3}{2\gamma} c(x^*).$$

The 2.5-approximation algorithm can then be derived by setting $\gamma = \frac{3}{5}$ since we get $c(T_{3/5}) \leq \frac{5}{2}c(x^*)$ and $\pi(V \setminus S(3/5)) \leq \frac{5}{2}\pi(\mathbf{1} - y^*)$. In [4], we have shown that one can get a better performance guarantee by taking the best cycle output over all possible values of γ ; notice that this leads to at most $n - 1$ different cycles.

The primal-dual algorithm in [5] constructs a cycle T and a dual solution to the linear programming relaxation above such that their values are within a factor 2 of each other, showing a performance guarantee of 2 since the value of any dual solution is a lower bound on LP . Chudak, Roughgarden and Williamson [3] (see their Theorem 2.1) observe that the analysis of [5] actually shows a stronger guarantee on the penalty side of the objective function, namely that the cycle T returned satisfies:

$$c(T) + \left(2 - \frac{1}{n-1}\right) \pi(V \setminus V(T)) \leq \left(2 - \frac{1}{n-1}\right) LP. \quad (1)$$

This increased factor on the penalty side is exploited in Archer et al. [1], and this motivated the result in this note. Suppose now that we apply the primal-dual algorithm to an instance in which we replace the penalties $\pi(\cdot)$ by $\pi'(\cdot)$ given by

$$\pi'(v) = \frac{1}{2 - 1/(n-1)} \pi(v). \quad (2)$$

Thus, (1) implies that the cycle T returned satisfies:

$$c(T) + \pi(V \setminus V(T)) \leq \left(2 - \frac{1}{n-1}\right) LP', \quad (3)$$

where LP' denotes the LP value for the penalties $\pi'(\cdot)$. As the optimum solution x^*, y^* of LP (with penalties $\pi(\cdot)$) is feasible for the linear programming relaxation with penalties $\pi'(\cdot)$, we derive that the cycle T_{pd} output satisfies:

$$\begin{aligned}
c(T_{pd}) + \pi(V \setminus V(T_{pd})) &= c(T_{pd}) + \left(2 - \frac{1}{n-1}\right) \pi'(V \setminus V(T_{pd})) \\
&\leq \left(2 - \frac{1}{n-1}\right) LP' \\
&\leq \left(2 - \frac{1}{n-1}\right) (c(x^*) + \pi'(\mathbf{1} - y^*)) \\
&= \left(2 - \frac{1}{n-1}\right) c(x^*) + \pi(\mathbf{1} - y^*).
\end{aligned}$$

Summarizing:

Proposition 2. *The primal-dual algorithm applied to an instance with penalties $\pi'(\cdot)$ given by (2) outputs a cycle T_{pd} such that*

$$c(T_{pd}) + \pi(V \setminus V(T_{pd})) \leq 2c(x^*) + \pi(\mathbf{1} - y^*).$$

We claim that the best of the algorithms given in Propositions 1 and 2 gives a better than 2 approximation guarantee for PC-TSP.

Theorem 3. *Let*

$$H = \min_{\gamma} (\min(c(T_{\gamma}) + \pi(V \setminus V(\gamma))), c(T_{pd}) + \pi(V \setminus V(T_{pd}))).$$

Then

$$H \leq \alpha (c(x^*) + \pi(\mathbf{1} - y^*)) = \alpha LP,$$

where $\alpha = \frac{1}{1 - \frac{2}{3}e^{-1/3}} < 1.91457$.

As mentioned earlier, the minimum in the theorem involves only n different algorithms as we need only to consider values γ equal to some y_v^* .

Proof. We construct an appropriate probability distribution over all the algorithms involved such that the expected cost of the solution produced is at most $\alpha (c(x^*) + \pi(\mathbf{1} - y^*))$.

First, assume that we select γ randomly (according to a certain distribution to be specified). Then, by Proposition 1, we have that

$$E[c(T_{\gamma})] \leq \frac{3}{2} E\left[\frac{1}{\gamma}\right] c(x^*),$$

while the expected penalty we have to pay is

$$E[\pi(V \setminus V(\gamma))] = \sum_{v \in V} Pr[\gamma > y^*(v)] \pi(v).$$

Thus, the overall expected cost is:

$$E[c(T_\gamma) + \pi(V \setminus V(\gamma))] \leq \frac{3}{2}E\left[\frac{1}{\gamma}\right]c(x^*) + \sum_{v \in V} Pr[\gamma > y^*(v)]\pi(v). \quad (4)$$

Assume now that γ is chosen uniformly between $a = e^{-1/3} = 0.71653 \dots$ and 1. Then,

$$E\left[\frac{1}{\gamma}\right] = \int_a^1 \frac{1}{1-a} \frac{1}{x} dx = -\frac{\ln(a)}{1-a} = \frac{1}{3(1-a)} = \frac{1}{3(1-e^{-1/3})},$$

and

$$Pr[\gamma > y] = \begin{cases} \frac{1-y}{1-a} & a \leq y \leq 1 \\ 1 \leq \frac{1-y}{1-a} & 0 \leq y \leq a. \end{cases}$$

Therefore, (4) becomes:

$$E[c(T_\gamma) + \pi(V \setminus V(\gamma))] \leq \frac{1}{2(1-e^{-1/3})}c(x^*) + \frac{1}{1-e^{-1/3}}\pi(\mathbf{1} - y^*). \quad (5)$$

Suppose we now select, with probability p , the primal-dual algorithm as given in Proposition 2 or, with probability $1-p$, the rounding algorithm with γ chosen randomly according to $\gamma \sim U[e^{-1/3}, 1]$. From (5) and Proposition 2, we get that the expected cost E^* of the resulting algorithm satisfies:

$$E^* \leq \left(2p + (1-p)\frac{1}{2(1-e^{-1/3})}\right)c(x^*) + \left(p + (1-p)\frac{1}{1-e^{-1/3}}\right)\pi(\mathbf{1} - y^*).$$

Choosing $p = (1-p)\frac{1}{2(1-e^{-1/3})}$, i.e. $p = \frac{1}{3-2e^{-1/3}}$, we get

$$E^* \leq 3p(c(x^*) + \pi(\mathbf{1} - y^*)) = 3pLP.$$

Therefore, the best of the algorithms involved outputs a solution of cost at most $3pLP = \alpha LP$ where

$$\alpha = \frac{1}{1 - \frac{2}{3}e^{-1/3}} < 1.91457.$$

□

One can show that the probability distribution given in the proof is optimal for the purpose of this proof; this is left as an exercise for the reader.

Theorem 3 shows that the linear programming relaxation of PC-TSP has an integrality gap bounded by 1.91457; in contrast, the result of Archer et al. [1] does not imply a better than 2 bound on the integrality gap.

As a final remark, if we replace Christofides' algorithm with an algorithm for the symmetric TSP that outputs a solution within a factor β of the standard LP relaxation for the TSP then the approach described in this note gives a guarantee of

$$\frac{1}{1 - \frac{1}{\beta}e^{1-2/\beta}}$$

for PC-TSP.

References

- [1] A. Archer, M. Bateni, M. Hajiaghayi and H. Karloff, “Improved Approximation Algorithms for Prize-Collecting Steiner Tree and TSP”, Proceedings of the 50th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, 2009.
- [2] D. Bienstock, M.X. Goemans, D. Simchi-Levi and D. Williamson, “A Note on the Prize Collecting Traveling Salesman Problem”, *Mathematical Programming*, **59**, 413–420, 1993.
- [3] F.A. Chudak, T. Roughgarden, and D.P. Williamson, “Approximate k-MSTs and k-Steiner trees via the primal-dual method and Lagrangean relaxation”, *Mathematical Programming*, **100**, 411–421, 2004.
- [4] M.X. Goemans, “The Prize-Collecting TSP Revisited”, talk at the SIAM Discrete Mathematics conference, Toronto, Canada, July 1998.
- [5] M.X. Goemans and D.P. Williamson, “A General Approximation Technique for Constrained Forest Problems”, *SIAM Journal on Computing*, **24**, 296–317, 1995.
- [6] D.B. Shmoys. ”Using linear programming in the design and analysis of approximation algorithms: two illustrative problems”, in: Approximation Algorithms for Combinatorial Optimization, Lecture Notes in Computer Science 1444 (K. Jansen and J. Rolim, eds.), Springer, Berlin, 15–32, 1998.
- [7] D.B. Shmoys and D.P. Williamson, “Analyzing the Held-Karp TSP lower bound: A monotonicity property with applications”, *Operations Research Letters*, **35**, 281–285, 1990.
- [8] L.A. Wolsey, “Heuristic analysis, linear programming and branch-and-bound”, *Mathematical Programming Study*, **13**, 121–134, 1980.